UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,579	09/20/2006	Eiichi Kaji	2006_1387A	1456
	7590 01/13/201 , LIND & PONACK, I	EXAMINER		
1030 15th Street, N.W.,			LU, C CAIXIA	
Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/593,579	KAJI ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Caixia Lu	1796		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) The Since this application is in condition for allow	is action is non-final.	osecution as to the merits is		
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
 4) Claim(s) 1,4,5,8 and 9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,5,8 and 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Applicati	on Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examir The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to th Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre The oath or declaration is objected to by the B	ecepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority ເ	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 11/10/09.	4)	ate		

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Smith et al. (US 5,831,109).

Smith's Examples 2 and 4 demonstrate the preparation of the polymethylaluminoxane (PMAO) composition substantially free of trimethylaluminum (TMAI) by reacting TMAI and benzoic acid in toluene with catalytic amount of polyaluminoxane (PMAO). It is noted that Smith does not expressly disclose the viscosity of the PMAO prepared from the examples. However, in Smith's PMAO preparation process, the reaction between TMAI and benzoic acid is quantitative; therefore, the molecular weight of PMAO can be controlled by varying the ratio of TMAI to benzoic acid. As the TMAL/benzoic acid increases, the molecular weight of PMAO decreases. It is noted that the ratios of TMAI/O of benzoic acid in Smith's Examples 2 and 4 are 1.27 and 1.25 respectively, which are about the same as the TMAI/O ratio of

Art Unit: 1796

1.26 of applicants' Example 5. One would have expected the molecular weight of Smith's PMAO to be less than of applicants' Example 5 since all of the TMAI is converted to the polymer while about 5.3 mol% (15.8 mol%/3) of TMAI in applicants' Example 5 is not converted. As shown in applicants' Remark of February 19, 2009, the aluminum concentrations of the generated PMAO reaction mixture are 3.25 wt% and 15.5 wt% for Smith's Examples 2 and 4 respectively, one would have expected those PMAO toluene solution to have a viscosity much less that that of applicants' Example 5. Therefore, one would have expected the PMAO solutions prepared Smith's Examples 2 and 4 to meet all limitations of the instant claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Mr. Kaji's Declaration filed June 19, 2009 is irrelevant to the new rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102/103 set forth above since the declaration fails to provide any data to show that Smith's Examples 2 and 4 do not meet the limitations of the instant claim.

It is also noted that the viscosity limitation of claim 1 is somewhat indefinite since the condition, at which the viscosity is measured, is not fully disclosed. It appears that the viscosity is measured for <u>the PMAO toluene solution</u> according the working examples disclosed in the specification; however, the concentration of PMAO and the solvent of toluene are not even mentioned in the claim.

Art Unit: 1796

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caixia Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1106. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Caixia Lu/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1796